

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the present application before this amendment as set forth above. By the amendment, claims 6 and 11-14 are amended, and claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10 are canceled.

In the March 11, 2008 Office Action, claims 1-6 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent JP 10-121205 alone or in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,702,140 to Sollo.

However, the Primary Examiner indicated claims 11-14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciates very much the Primary Examiner's careful review of the instant application and indication of the allowability of claims 11-14.

In response, as set forth above, claims 6 and 11-14 have been amended. Specifically, claim 11 has been rewritten, according to the Primary Examiner's suggestion, in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, now canceled claim 1, and the intervening claims, now canceled claims 2 and 4. Claim 13 has been rewritten, according to the Primary Examiner's suggestion, in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, now canceled claim 1, and the intervening claims, now canceled claims 2 and 5. Furthermore, to facilitate the prosecution of the current application, claims 11 and 13 have been amended to explicitly define the terms "Φ360mm", "Φ510mm", "R16", "R11", "R10" and "R5", although the use of the terms is known to the people skilled in the art that "Φ" represents diameter and "R" represents radius, respectively. For example, the terms "a wafer of about Φ360mm" and "a wafer of about Φ510mm" are replaced with "the diameter Φ of the wafer is about 360mm" and "the diameter Φ of the wafer is about 510mm", respectively. The terms "R16", "R11", "R10" and "R5" are explicitly described by "R16 that characterizes the male die having a corner radius $R = 16\text{mm}$ ", "R11 that characterizes the female die having a corner radius $R = 11\text{mm}$ ", "R10 that characterizes the female die having a corner radius $R = 10\text{mm}$ " and "R5 that characterizes the female die having a corner radius $R = 5\text{mm}$ ", respectively. Therefore, applicant respectfully

submits that the §112 rejections to claims 11-14 are overcome.

Moreover, claims 12 and 14 have been amended to replace the terms “an elongation coefficient of about 0.53” and “an elongation coefficient of about 0.79” with “an elongation coefficient of in a range of about 0.52-0.55” and “an elongation coefficient of in a range of about 0.78-0.80”, respectively. Support for the amendments can be found in paragraphs from page 4, lines 27-30 through page 5, lines 1-17 of the specification, as originally filed.

Accordingly, amended claims 11-14 are now allowable, as indicated by the Primary Examiner. Additionally, claim 6 has been amended to be dependent from now allowable amended claim 11. Therefore, amended claim 6 is also allowable.

Without acquiescing in the propriety of the Primary Examiner's rejections and to facilitate the prosecution of the current application, claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10 have been canceled, which makes the Primary Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and §103 to claims 1-5, 7, 8 and 10 moot.

Additionally, the specification has been amended for a better form so that the amended claims, the written description, abstract and the drawings are consistent with each other. Specifically, in the paragraphs from page 4, lines 15-35 through page 5, lines 1-4, the terms “Φ360mm”, “Φ510mm”, “R16”, “R11”, “R10” and “R5” have explicitly been described.

Applicant asserts that no new matter is added.

Any amendments to the claims not specifically referred to herein as being included for the purpose of distinguishing the claims from cited references are included for the purpose of clarification, consistence and/or grammatical correction only.

It is now believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 404-495-3678.

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP

April 21, 2008



Tim Tingkang Xia
Attorney for the Applicants on the Record
Reg. No.: 45,242

Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP
3343 Peachtree Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30326-1044
Telephone: 404.233.7000
Customer No. 24728